

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/820,313	TAKAO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Callie E. Shosho	1714	

All Participants:

(1) Callie E. Shosho.

(2) John Bailey.

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 January 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

7,9,14

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in ~~the Notice of Allowability~~. *Part II above.*
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. Bailey in order that (i) the recitation of claim 7 has proper antecedent basis, (ii) claim 9 recites proper Markush group, and (iii) it is clear in claim 14 that the silicone graft polymer is "obtained from" an acrylic compound. Support for the amendment to claim 14 is found, for instance, on pages 14-15 of the present specification.